

<b><i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/598,471	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SHINDO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Vanessa Velasquez	<b>Art Unit</b> 1793	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) Vanessa Velasquez, Examiner.

(2) William Bak, Applicants' Representative.

**Date of Interview:** 30 June 2009

**Type of Interview:**  
☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
N/A

Claims discussed:  
1, 10, 11, 13-15, 18, 21, 22, 23-26

Prior art documents discussed:  
N/A

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**Status of Application:** Response received after non-final rejection

(3) \_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

**Time:** 11:40 AM

  

/Vanessa Velasquez/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1793

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner spoke with Mr. William Bak on June 25, 2009 and June 30, 2009 to discuss proposed examiner's amendments. Incorporation of claims 10 and 18 into claims 1 and 15, respectively, were proposed. Dependent claims 13, 14, 21, and 22 were deemed redundant if the above incorporation were made, and their cancellation was proposed. Deletion of the language "such as" in claims 10 and 18 was also discussed. Mr. Bak inquired about withdrawn method claims 23-26, which are drawn to a method of making the product of allowable claim 1. The Examiner indicated that these claims may be rejoined and subsequently indicated allowable upon amending the independent method claim to recite all the features of the allowable product claim. The proposed amendments were agreed upon.